

REMARKS

Claim 43 has been amended, and claims 46 and 47 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been added. For instance, support for the amendment appears e.g. in the original claims of the application.

Claims 43, 45-49 and 51-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Sinta et al. (U.S. 57313634) in view of Doessel et al. (U.S. 4946759). The rejection is traversed.

The Sinta et al. document does not disclose the present claimed subject matter in a manner sufficient to sustain the instant Section 103 rejection.

For instance, in the examples of the Sinta et al. document, the only photoresist solvent used is ethyl lactate (only), which is not a non-hydroxylic solvent. See Sinta patent at column 18, lines 59-65.

Sinta et al. also does not exemplify use of the lipophilic substituents as recited in the present claims, i.e. one or more photoacid generator moieties having 6 or more carbon atoms. For instance, in the Examples of the Sinta document, the counter ions reported include tosylate ($\text{CH}_3\text{C}_6\text{H}_5\text{SO}_3$), triflate (CF_3SO_3), and 5-dimethylamino-1-naphthalenesulfonate.

At column 11, lines 10-24 of the Sinta patent, a rather extensive list of photoresist solvents are identified. No suggestion is seen to select a solvent as Applicant claims, or the good results that would be provided by that selection, as is specifically demonstrated in the examples of the present application.

In this regard, attention is directed to the comparative data set forth in the application as filed. Thus, at pages 25-27, results of Example 1 and Example 1a, wherein enhanced storage stability was exhibited with as sulfonium photoacid generator as disclosed in the present application (see Example 1 pages 26-27) versus the composition of Example 1a that did not include a sulfonium photoacid generator compound. Similar results were obtained in Example 2 and Comparative Example 2a (pages 27 and 28 of the application) and Example 3 and Comparative 3a (pages 28 and 29 of the application).

The addition of Doessel et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of the rejection. Among other things, the Doessel et al. document does not suggest the use of the lipophilic substituents as recited in the present claims, i.e. one or more photoacid generator moieties having 6 or more carbon atoms.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are requested.

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Peter F. Corless/
Peter F. Corless

Registration No.: 33,860
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874
Boston, Massachusetts 02205
(617) 517-5557
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant